

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ELIJAH GHEDAMSI,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

SHAWN TRAVIS RANIER BISHOP, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:24-cv-01530-GMN-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 9]

Pending before the Court is the parties' joint discovery plan. Docket No. 9. The discovery plan fails in numerous ways. Most significantly, the discovery period seeks an elongated discovery period, but no justification has been provided to justify that relief other than a cryptic statement that longer deadlines are warranted "[b]ased upon the evidence reviewed by counsel." *Id.* at 1. That assertion is not helpful and is not "a statement of reasons why longer . . . time periods should apply to the case." Local Rule 26-1(a). In addition, the discovery plan violates other provisions, including that it seeks special scheduling review but does not so indicate, *id.*, the number of days for discovery must be measured from the Defendant's first appearance or answer (not from the Rule 26(f) conference, Local Rule 26-1(b)(1), the discovery plan for unknown reasons seeks a deadline for initial experts 90 days before the discovery cutoff rather than the default of 60 days, Local Rule 26-1(b)(3), and the discovery plan references extensions pursuant to "LR 26-4," even though the governing provision was moved to Local Rule 26-3 years ago.

Accordingly, the discovery plan is **DENIED** without prejudice. Counsel must immediately review the pertinent local rules. An amended discovery plan must be filed by October 15, 2024.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 8, 2024


 Nancy J. Koppe
 United States Magistrate Judge